

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 21, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the attached amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented here are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has indicated that claims 11-14 are in condition for allowance, and that claim 24 would be allowable but for the objection thereto. Applicants cordially thank the Examiner for indication of the allowable subject matter. Claims 1-10, 15-23, 25 and 26 stand rejected. Claims 1, 6, 11, 15, 18, 23 and 24 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-26 based on the amendment and the following remarks.

Specification Objections

The Examiner indicates that the Specification is objected to because the Abstract of the Disclosure is not in the proper format for the reasons stated on page 2 of the present Office action. The Examiner also states on page 2 that the title of the invention is not descriptive and that a new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

First, it is respectfully submitted that the title of the invention, as it presently stands, iterates the invention to which the claims are directed, as the preamble of each of the claims is representative of the title. More specifically, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the preamble of each of the independent claims, which taken together reflects the title of the invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the requirement for a new title for at least this reason.

Second, it is respectfully noted that the Abstract has been amended above in conformance with MPEP § 608.01(b).

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 6, 11 and 18 stand objected to for the following informalities. The Examiner states that the limitation "eccentrically" recited in claim 6 is misspelled and should be corrected to "essentially". The Examiner states that the limitation "a light emitting patterns" in claim 11 should be corrected to "light emitting patterns." Finally, the Examiner also states that the limitation "an edge portion of the insulation member is extended form the first region to the second region so as to form a substantially same interval between the openings" is imprecise and requires correction.

Claims 6, 11 and 18 have been amended as suggested by the examiner.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 15, 16, 18-20, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0111957, hereinafter "Kim"). The Examiner states that Kim discloses all of the limitations of the abovementioned claims, primarily in FIGS. 3, 4 and 18a-21c. As amended, independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 18 includes the limitation of *a second electrode disposed . . . directly on the insulation member*. This limitation is not taught or suggested in the prior art. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 11, 15 and 18, and claims 16, 19, 20, 22 and 23 depending therefrom, as amended.

In particular, FIGS. 3 and 4 of Kim relied upon by the Examiner discloses the second electrodes (14) disposed directly on the organic layer (30) and the organic layer (30) on an insulating wall (22), which in turn is on a separate inter-insulator (20). (Paragraphs [0051-0053]).

More specifically, Kim does not teach or suggest a second electrode disposed on the light emitting patterns and directly on the insulation member, as in amended independent claims 1, 11 and 15, and similarly claimed in amended independent claim 18. Therefore, claims 1, 11, 15 and 18, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-10, 12-14 and 16-26, define over Kim.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 1, 15, 16, 18-20, 22 and 23 under § 102(b) be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Claims 1-7, 10, 15, 17-21, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Nakanishi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0070808, hereinafter "Nakanishi"). The Examiner states that Nakanishi discloses all of the limitations of the abovementioned claims, primarily in FIGS. 2-5, 7a-7d and 8 and paragraphs 74-76. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reasons set forth below.

As amended, independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 18 includes the limitation of *light emitting patterns disposed directly on the first electrodes*. This limitation is not taught or suggested in the prior art. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 11, 15 and 18, and claims 2-7, 10, 17, 19-21, 25 and 26 depending therefrom, as amended.

In particular, FIG. 4 of Nakanishi relied upon by the Examiner discloses a layer (25) (not described in the specification) interposed between the anode (23) and the EL layer (60). Likewise, FIG. 5, and in particular FIG. 5(b), of Nakanishi relied upon by the Examiner discloses an inorganic bank layer (221a) interposed between the anode (23) and the EL layer (60).

More specifically, Nakanishi does not teach or suggest light emitting patterns disposed **directly** on the first electrodes, as in amended independent claims 1 and 11, 15, and similarly claimed in amended independent claim 18. Therefore, claims 1, 11, 15 and 18, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-10, 12-14 and 16-26, define over Nakanishi.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 1-7, 10, 15, 17-21, 25 and 26 under § 102(e) be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Nakanishi in view of Nagayama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,220, hereinafter "Nagayama"). The Examiner states that Nakanishi discloses all of the elements of claim 8

except, *the angle of the inside wall of the openings*, which the Examiner states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 2a, the Abstract, and column 5, lines 45-57 of Nagayama. The Examiner states that Nakanishi discloses all of the elements of claim 9 except, *the second electrode includes an opaque conductive material*, which the Examiner states is disclosed primarily in column 5, lines 57-64 of Nagayama. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reasons set forth below.

First, it is respectfully noted that claims 8 and 9 depend from amended independent claim 1, which is respectfully submitted as being allowable for defining over Kim as discussed above. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that use of *the angle of the inside wall of the openings* allegedly discloses in Nagayama does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Nakanishi.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 8 and 9 under § 102(e) be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks distinguishing the prior art of record, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' Attorneys at the below-listed telephone number regarding this Amendment or otherwise regarding the present application in order to address any questions or remaining issues concerning the same. If there are any charges due in connection with this response, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Registration No. 43,801
Confirmation No. 1578
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Customer No. 23413

Date: March 20, 2007